

1 FAA'S MEETING OF THE
2 PROPOSED FLIGHT AND DEPARTURE PLAN
3 OF MCCARRAN AIRPORT
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

12 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
13
14

15 DECEMBER 13, 2005
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **ORIGINAL**
24

25 Reported by: CINDY R. BOWDEN, CCR #815

1 MEETING OF THE PROPOSED FLIGHT PLAN,
2 taken at 10200 Centennial Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada, on
3 Tuesday, December 13, 2005, at 5:56 p.m., before Cindy
4 R. Bowden, Certified Court Reporter, in and for the
5 State of Nevada.

1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2005;

2 5:56 P.M.

3 -oOo-

4 MR. CARNER: Bill Carner, C-a-r-n-e-r,
5 8513 Del Rey Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada 89117. Thank you
6 for having this workshop and public comment section. I
7 just wished it was located or even near the proposed
8 departure flight path. That way we would be more
9 assured that we would have received a broad base of
10 input from those most effected. Intuition and common
11 sense tells me that it is better to fly over less
12 populated areas than densely populated areas. Safety
13 and noise being the major concerns.

14 I think that is the prevailing wisdom at
15 most, if not all metropolitan airports. This purports
16 the airport's path goes against both common sense and
17 prevailing wisdom. I also believe that the signs does
18 not support the change and the departure path. It is a
19 given that reducing ground clearance reduces a pilot's
20 margin of error. All aviation and turbine engine
21 experts, plus pilots likely agree that jet engine thrust
22 and aircraft lift is reduced in warmer summer clients
23 like we have here in Southern Nevada.

24 Also these same experts undoubtedly agree
25 that aircraft gain altitude for less ground distance

1 after taking off when flying into the wind. It does not
2 make a lick of sense to me that in our hot summer
3 climate that it would discount the two most basic rules
4 of implementing a safe takeoff.

5 In Los Angeles at LAX, the departing flights
6 take off heading west, into the wind for lift and over
7 the ocean to avoid populated areas for safety. In all
8 the departing domestic flights plus the significant
9 number of international flights require that the
10 aircraft may either turn to the north or south to go
11 east and it makes me pause and think that if it works
12 for them, why not keep it the same way here so it works
13 for us.

14 In the last few days I have taken the time
15 and happened to personally witness departing flights in
16 the current departure path and the sparsely populated
17 area this last Saturday and Sunday between the hours of
18 1300 and 1400 hours. During this time I have measured
19 the sound levels that were departing McCarran, flights
20 and paths over various streets; Warm Springs, Blue
21 Diamond, Wigwam, and near Warm Springs.

22 I used the Radio Shack sound level meter to
23 measure the sound level decibels, it's the same meter I
24 used when I was in the fire alarm industry. The average
25 for the 27 flights I measured was 71 decibels. At this

1 workshop, I asked a sound expert who had viewed the
2 measurements if they seemed to be in the ballpark? He
3 said, Yes, they are. I did not agree that -- I do not
4 agree that the 60 decibels DNL is the correct way to
5 analyze the effect of jet engines have on our
6 residences.

7 I think lay people would agree that numbers
8 measuring the sound level are meaningless when they have
9 something to relate to. At least 27 consecutive
10 departure flights with at least an average sound level
11 of 71 decibels of aircraft noise that were put into our
12 backyard every few minutes. And this is the reality.
13 This is not a DNL measurement that's really over a long
14 period of time. This is what I measured in the middle
15 of the afternoon when people have barbecues in their
16 backyards.

17 According to several Web sites that I
18 visited, noisy freeway traffic and vacuum cleaners have
19 levels of 70 decibels, sound levels of 70 decibels.
20 Imagine having a freeway or vacuum cleaner in your
21 backyard every few minutes and the noise level. That is
22 just plain wrong and against the populated area. Now,
23 let's look at the high end. I measured one aircraft at
24 83 decibels and seven above 75 decibels. As a
25 reference, Nevada State Law requires all fire alarm

1 evacuations used to put out 80 decibels in occupied
2 areas such as the schools or hotel rooms where people
3 sleep. Eighty decibels is necessary to wake people up
4 to the sound, sleep, or a person taking a shower so they
5 can save their lives, and this will be in our backyards.

6 This noise level reiterates to a hairdryer
7 in your ear or sound two feet away from your alarm clock
8 or standing in front of your sink or the garbage
9 disposal. Imagine that in your backyard a few times an
10 hour. This, again, is just plain wrong and in a densely
11 populated area. While taking the sound levels
12 measurement -- it's apparent to me that the departing
13 flights at McCarran Airport did not ascend at all the
14 same rate. I measured lower sound levels of the
15 aircraft that descended more rapidly.

16 Is it possible to start implementing sound
17 abatement procedures at McCarran like at other airports?
18 The safety issue associated for flying over densely
19 populated areas versus sparsely populated areas should
20 be common sense. A dialogue should not be needed. I am
21 very hopeful that our Federal Government will take the
22 time and effort to apply common sense in matters such as
23 this.

24 In Summerlin changing departure path of the
25 proposed path is the wrong decision because:

1 1) It will expose more Valley residences and
2 the possibility of catastrophic accidents and that is in
3 the event of a plane crash. The aircraft will lift even
4 further and faster, and thank you.

5 SPEAKER ONE: I have a question about the
6 noise. It says five decibel increase. I want to know
7 what that -- what does that mean in layman's terms? And
8 what can you compare it to something that I would know?

9 MR. MEADOWS: I have no answer to that
10 question. I am going to refer you to the noise people.
11 Noise is not my area of expertise.

12 MR. LIEBER: The environment process is as
13 far as noise impact is predicated on the 65 DNL level
14 and the only way I can explain that is if he or she and
15 I had a normal conversation, that would be about 55
16 decibels. If the lady coming behind her stood up and
17 raised her voice and interrupted my normal conversation,
18 and to the point where I had to raise my voice, we could
19 hear each other, that we would break off that 65 over
20 increase impact here.

21 So, see, if this lady stood up and was
22 speaking to the point where I have to raise my voice to
23 this lady. I can't tell you what five decibel increase
24 would be because I really don't know. But the
25 illustration I'm trying to give you is an increase over

1 65, where I have to raise my voice to basically hear the
2 impact. I hope that answers your question. I can't
3 give you what five decibels is.

4 SPEAKER TWO: I will try to address that
5 question. My father and I live on Shadow Peak -- house
6 here in Summerlin. Sixty-five feet is, per se, five
7 more decibels. It's like I'm screaming at you. It's
8 not just five more. It's not like 60 on the height.
9 Sixty-five has directed for many years with the large
10 construction company. And I was in so I didn't
11 understand the levels.

12 SPEAKER THREE: (Inaudible). Sunrise south
13 nothing has been ended on population density about the
14 area representing -- represented 7,000 population, but
15 current to the south represents as high Boulder City as
16 far populated in, but nor are they populated. I
17 understand your concern and why we have 700,000
18 southwestern and we have 700,000 up on the northeast.

19 That's fair about that regulation in the FAA
20 is not on population density. You have (Inaudible) to
21 refer to the document. Are you at chapter three where
22 it talks about the path landing and over flight for
23 residential areas, residential boss lakes area? My
24 question is -- boils down to what alternatives are being
25 considered? You seem to have two. One is stay where

1 you are and -- airport and others are to fly to the
2 center part of the city.

3 I realize that a lot of planes can't fly
4 west from the runway over the mountains and for that
5 reason you are turning. But I also -- I'm aware that
6 most planes you can, according to you and FAA and
7 McCarran, so why couldn't we turn the planes that can't
8 go over the mountains south and those that can keep
9 going?

10 MR. MEADOWS: Although, I'm sure some
11 aircraft can go out. We cannot build a procedure with
12 clearness requirements over mountains that will be above
13 the procedures for aircraft to fly. When we publish a
14 procedure, it all has to be able to fly procedurally
15 safely or we cannot publish.

16 SPEAKER FOUR: I know flying. Trust me, I
17 do. And flying over a hundred populated area is not the
18 way it goes down back east and when the plane landed in
19 Chicago, a six-year-old kid -- that's not funny, because
20 the plane turbulence, you have no control over the
21 turbulence. And that drops from one to two thousand
22 feet just like that, even a lot. So if something
23 happened when that plane was dropped whatever. And
24 following a heavily dense populated area, it would not
25 please people. It is too dangerous for this type of

1 area. I live right there so I'd like to take this
2 opportunity. So it's okay.

3 And when the planes at Nellis Air Force Base
4 Show twice a year, fine. But to fly over a highly
5 populated area, I think it's extremely, extremely
6 dangerous and should be avoided at all costs.

7 SPEAKER FIVE: I live in Summerlin. I'd
8 like to know how often and how many planes do we expect
9 to fly over our house in a 24-hour period. And I'd also
10 like to know why (Inaudible) conversation in a long-term
11 planning before they purchased their homes and before
12 people were not disclosed that? But that there was a
13 possibility that there would be an implied zone.

14 MR. MEADOWS: I can speak for the numbers.
15 As it stands right now, go to a slide that shows the
16 procedure of a runway. This new procedure will take all
17 the aircraft that had followed this route, the
18 destinations that include this route to help with the
19 McCarran departures, and before there was even a spell
20 check out there, everything had five letters when we
21 named these.

22 It is called the Trailer Departure
23 Destination. Salt Lake City, Chicago, New York -- those
24 airports so any aircraft departing McCarran right now
25 today has that trailer departure. If they are -- will

1 fly the new procedure which is a right turn, the
2 document estimates that to be up to 33 percent to give
3 you a real snapshot. The airport traffic for the
4 Thursday before the Thanksgiving, we had 844 departures,
5 211 during that day. We're on the trailer, so they
6 would have flown the departure.

7 SPEAKER SIX: 3950 Starfield Lane, two
8 questions. Really, I want to thank you for tonight
9 compared to last night. This is more -- I thank you for
10 allowing this.

11 How long ago was this decided for this
12 particular flight plan? Can you honestly say about a
13 year?

14 MR. MEADOWS: You mean the procedure as
15 proposed?

16 SPEAKER SIX: Right.

17 MR. MEADOWS: To be honest with you, Joe,
18 from October 2001 when we made those changes, our desire
19 was to continue to make that right turn all the way
20 around.

21 SPEAKER SIX: Right, so 2001. This is now
22 December of 2005. You're going to implement this flight
23 plan in June of '06 which is about six months. And now
24 we're just hearing about it and we have only got two
25 days to have the discussion with the FAA. It's not

1 fair. It's not fair.

2 Now, one other question, that will be it for
3 tonight. Is the FAA going to do like they did in
4 Chicago? Because I am from Chicago. I lived in Chicago
5 blocks away from Midway Airport until I moved here in
6 '99. My sister still lives there. The Federal
7 Government turned around and expanded Midway Airport,
8 increased the flight plan. They gave money to the
9 homeowners so they could enhance and improve their
10 homes. And why not is the Government doing that?

11 And the other question is, are you aware
12 that right now in the southwest area of the Valley, we
13 have nine homes that are in litigation because of
14 construction defects? And are you aware -- did you pass
15 the note when 300 some-odd planes are going to be flying
16 24/7 in the area? How that is going to make the homes
17 leave in two years from now? Because according to
18 staffing engineers, they are now in discussion of making
19 engines to these jets. They said that in two years that
20 our homes are going to feel like they went through a
21 major earthquake. Who do we believe here?

22 MR. MEADOWS: Well as I stated, any
23 questions about what -- any questions about what the
24 procedure is, what the process is going through, yes, we
25 can answer those. Any other questions you have such as

1 the one he just asked are going to go in the record and
2 be answered as part of the document.

3 (Several discussions were held off the record.)

4 SPEAKER SEVEN: -- soundproofing your home
5 like they did in Chicago and Midway?

6 MR. MEADOWS: I can't answer that tonight.

7 SPEAKER SEVEN: -- it's a proposal. No,
8 it's not. They don't give a shit about you.

9 SPEAKER EIGHT: A quick question for you.
10 You stated that there's not a procedure that went
11 westbound. Now, let me clarify this for you one way,
12 two-five standards lower than standard if authorized and
13 there is a minimum read at 220 feet from that. From
14 that 2,400 feet and ATC congregated of 400 (Inaudible)
15 to 13,000 people. So there's a procedure and that's
16 approached and your procedure -- your procedure, per
17 your deal, there has for minimum occupancy at this going
18 westbound to your 70,000 feet is normal for the field.

19 So they can come out over our homes and
20 whatever altitude they choose, unless departure is here
21 that you have already published. So I mean as far as
22 making it fair for the folks that live out here, I would
23 (Inaudible) both departure. We have it right now.

24 It doesn't go over the mountains. But if
25 you had an emergency procedure which is the minimum safe

1 altitude going westbound is 13,000 feet, 200 feet,
2 13,200 feet, that's if there's an emergency. On your
3 new requirements that you haven't published which is
4 already published here have that 7,000 feet north of
5 Nellis Air Force.

6 MR. MEADOWS: Remember everything that
7 you're talking about here is that out there today has
8 below right here. There's restrictions on the right
9 turn or at above 5,000 and at or above 5,000.

10 SPEAKER EIGHT: 7,000 feet is not until --

11 MR. MEADOWS: Right here is at or above
12 5,000.

13 SPEAKER EIGHT: Sorry. It's not published.

14 MR. MEADOWS: Well, the procedure isn't
15 published yet. The existing south departure that we are
16 talking about --

17 SPEAKER EIGHT: The current departure is
18 which you don't give out because it's not approved. It
19 is not an impact said here. It's something. But it's
20 published right here, and there's no minimum altitude
21 westbound so they can go out to that point.

22 You could give an altitude to approve before
23 they take off, but they can take their sweet time to get
24 that 7,000 north of Nellis and be already near; is that
25 not true?

1 MR. MEADOWS: No, that isn't correct. Long
2 distance procedure departure that is modifying the one
3 in existence today turns into northbound. So it's turn
4 the first restriction in the proposed procedure that
5 we're talking about is right here, at or above 5,000
6 feet. The next restriction is at or above 7,000 feet.
7 And that is simply what I believe the concrete in this
8 procedure is 330 feet.

9 SPEAKER NINE: That's correct. And what is
10 going to be for the new departure?

11 MR. MEADOWS: Like I said --

12 SPEAKER NINE: Okay. Why can't you increase
13 that to eight -- to 7,000 or 8,000 feet which you have
14 approached there?

15 MR. MEADOWS: Keep in mind when you're
16 looking at that departure is 12 knots, that departure
17 still does not go west over the mountains, both the
18 departures. One, the existing left departures. It has
19 a 7,000 foot restriction here and it crosses over
20 restriction at or above is thirty south. Those
21 procedures are in use right now.

22 SPEAKER NINE: Correct. Why can't you make
23 that point at which you want to outside for the turn?
24 Why can't you make that out or above 7,000 or 8,000
25 feet? That makes a whole lot of difference on five

1 decibels from that 7,000 or 8,000 feet versus 5,000?

2 MR. MEADOWS: Let me ask you this: Are you
3 asking from a perspective, from a residence in the
4 southwest?

5 SPEAKER NINE: Absolutely.

6 MR. MEADOWS: Okay. I'm sorry. All right.
7 Well, let me address that the reason that we have at or
8 below 7,000 on all the south procedures. All the ones
9 that turn left because of all the arrival traffic
10 because except for a thousand to the final descending to
11 8,000 right across this. Our separate requirements are
12 a thousand feet minimum. So the departure, the arrival
13 until they pass each other. I'm sorry. I misunderstood
14 your question.

15 SPEAKER NINE: I'm aware of the arrivals.
16 You could move that arrival further south and bring this
17 altitude up for this departure very easily because
18 there's nothing out there. And you can bring it right
19 down in for two-five and everybody is happy and I'm not.
20 It's a waste of time.

21 MR. MEADOWS: We will have this discussion
22 with you later. But tonight's discussion is about
23 proposed flight and departure and modification of this
24 procedure.

25 SPEAKER NINE: We're not going to win this

1 discussion at all here. And showing them out and that
2 seems to be the -- (Inaudible). I have a couple of
3 questions for you. One of them claims so as far as that
4 gentleman go over some of the whole city. Probably
5 where we are right now that a citizen who lives there at
6 least bought the first lot in 1985. And when it's
7 deliberate because of the takeoff of the planes, and it
8 is very unfair as a citizen, some delivery planes.

9 Secondly, this standard is more. I live at
10 Charleston and 215 and the entire maintenance of
11 business has to be a paramount of traffic and noise out
12 there for residences there. This Primm Valley for a
13 person and so far as people (Inaudible).

14 I think we should get a plan because the
15 United States that kill citizens and which is very
16 likely 500 a day and all people.

17 SPEAKER TEN: My name is Mark. I live in
18 Summerlin. I've lived in the Lakes for 13 years. In
19 Summerlin, in 2001 we have never had plane problems
20 before. I do have a question, though. And if you could
21 clarify when you talk about it being 5,000 feet when
22 it's above Hualapai and 215, all 7,000 feet above ground
23 at the time and Lake Mead, is that above sea level or is
24 that above ground?

25 MR. MEADOWS: No, that is above sea level.

1 So the ground --

2 SPEAKER TEN: So you're telling me that the
3 plane at Hualapai and 215 is only going to be 2,500 feet
4 above my house?

5 MR. MEADOWS: Like I said, keep in mind,
6 this procedure is a thousand feet that was in place four
7 years ago.

8 SPEAKER TEN: There was nothing four years
9 ago. We had nothing out there four years ago. I have
10 lived in the Lakes for 13 years.

11 MR. MEADOWS: Prior to October of '01 --

12 SPEAKER TEN: I had one of the first
13 questions here is about this noise level. You know that
14 it is only going up five decibel points, but right now
15 my backyard I have no noise. So who is talking about it
16 has already 65 decibel points? I don't have any noise.
17 So am I going to go from zero to 70 decibel points in my
18 backyard?

19 So I don't understand how they calculate
20 what people in Summerlin have and the Lakes have in
21 their backyard now which is near zero and how it will
22 only go up five decibel points or dBAs or whatever the
23 --

24 MR. MEADOWS: Scott, the noise expert in the
25 far left back corner can address your question.

1 SPEAKER ELEVEN: I live at Tropicana. I
2 lived there since 1996. I work in the industry, so I
3 can address the little decibel level questions that you
4 have. In the year 2000 I did a report about this
5 backyard, and it's an 85 decibel level to give me -- not
6 knowing would be every 39 seconds. (Noise demonstration
7 was performed.)

8 First question, how often would you suggest
9 I would be hearing that under the proposed plan?

10 MR. MEADOWS: The departure periods that we
11 have at the airport are pretty much in credence of
12 specific times of day. Departure period or early
13 afternoon, we have busy departure late at night. So if
14 25 percent of the traffic or 30 percent of the traffic
15 is going to depart throughout the day, you would have
16 more during the busy departure period than you would
17 other times of day.

18 I can't tell you specifically per hour how
19 many there would be because the departure breaks change
20 every day.

21 SPEAKER ELEVEN: I see. Thank you for
22 trying to answer my question. I'm going to leave this
23 CD running on seven-minute intervals. If it bothers
24 you, again, I apologize. I would also like to say thank
25 you for listening to my comment and our public officials

1 for being here today. I'd also like to encourage
2 Congressman Shelley Berkley to listen to this tape. I
3 lived there -- where I lived since 1996, and I have a
4 broken window. I couldn't talk in my backyard to
5 someone across the table from me because the plane would
6 come by, and I would have to pause or pause my comments.
7 Also, according to the height -- that the planes -- that
8 they take off, there may be -- still suggest, sir, there
9 really should be a penalty for flying below that sea
10 level, would that be true?

11 MR. MEADOWS: No, that is not true. Any
12 aircraft that can comply with ground restrictions --

13 SPEAKER ELEVEN: Okay. Well, I can tell you
14 that there's no uniform to how high the planes take off.
15 Sometimes they're low. Sometimes they're high.
16 Sometimes they're in an angle. Sometimes they're to the
17 east. And I had called regarding this topic to McCarran
18 Airport, and I never got a call back. I can show you
19 where I did call several times. So that's the same
20 person -- reply to that comment that way.

21 Has there been an impact study that stated
22 how many people, how many residences this altered flight
23 plan will affect? Sir, 700,000 my -- that at least
24 eight schools will be affected, at least two libraries,
25 established churches, and three hospitals. And it

1 doesn't sound like a good idea, just to save some fuel
2 and airplanes. I'd also like to say that I called the
3 police department today. Well, how noisy is too noisy?

4 And it's my understanding that if a car has
5 an officer, and a person is 75 feet away that they can
6 be cited. And that's not very far. 75 feet away from
7 here is a stereo. I can assure you my backyard, if I
8 could, if somebody did it. Next, sir, if you think you
9 personally -- do you personally think that it's a good
10 idea to shake my house and wake my two-year-old daughter
11 in the afternoon or in the evening?

12 MR. MEADOWS: You know, the way we started
13 this. Like I said, I meant this is a very sensitive
14 subject for many, many people.

15 SPEAKER ELEVEN: How about a yes or no
16 answer, sir?

17 MR. MEADOWS: As the airport and the area
18 continues to grow, we're supposed to develop procedures
19 to that growth. Unfortunately, living in any area that
20 is observed by a major airport, there is going to be
21 airport noise and that's just something all of us here
22 in the Valley live with because of the --

23 SPEAKER ELEVEN: I'm asking you, sir, do you
24 think it's a good idea, sir?

25 MR. MEADOWS: I would prefer that nobody was

1 -- to airport noise ever, but I don't get to make those
2 choices. We have an airport here. My job as far as my
3 government -- the airport safely and efficiently. I
4 don't get to decide where the airport is and how many
5 people use it.

6 SPEAKER ELEVEN: Effect and safety and
7 security is not just in the planes flying itself --

8 (Discussions were held off the record.)

9 MR. CARNER: In summary, changing the
10 departure path to the proposed path is the wrong
11 decision because one that will eventually expose more
12 Valley residences to possible catastrophic accidents in
13 the event of a plane crash. Aircraft lifts will be even
14 further subordinated in the hot Las Vegas climate, but
15 not utilizing the prevailing southwestern summer winds
16 during the departure flights.

17 The residences under the current departure
18 path have less noises because of departing flights take
19 advantage of the prevailing winds for increased aircraft
20 lifts. Pilot air consideration and marginal safety will
21 be diminished changing to the proposed route. Number
22 five, the proposed change if implemented will diminish
23 the quality of life for more Las Vegas Valley residences
24 and mature areas of the Valley by 500,000. I've heard
25 somewhere that's a half million people.

1 In closing, I was recommending that the
2 signs of the aeronautics does not support the FAA
3 proposal and that more analyses by an outside
4 consultant; that it is an unbiased position used to
5 perform analysis. Whether or not the science does
6 support the FAA proposal or not, I'm recommending that
7 more analyses by an analyzing specialist to listen to an
8 unbiased abatement procedure similar to the procedure
9 being used daily at John Wayne Airport in Orange County,
10 California.

11 I believe the name for it has something to
12 do with the thrusts, increased thrust or something like
13 that. Also, the FAA needs to look at other options to
14 mitigate the adverse effect aircraft noise we have in
15 the community before making any changes. Thank you.

16 MR. ADLER: I'd like to add this. Why
17 hasn't anyone thought of a compromise rather than have a
18 fixed number of planes turning right like a hundred and
19 fifty or whatever the amount is? This number is to
20 relieve the situation back at the airport? Why can't
21 they have a safety value compromise where -- when there
22 are a certain number of aircraft sitting on the tarmac
23 six, 10 or 12 or whatever it might be during the daytime
24 hours. Only a certain number of planes had tried to
25 make the right-hand pattern.

1 And limiting it to say 50 a day at the most
2 to alleviate the situation that are ground. It seems to
3 me like a fair compromise. I think there should be
4 another open panel discussion somewhere about
5 compromising somehow. And so that we're not driven out
6 of our minds by aircraft noise all day long. That's
7 about it. Thank you.

8 MS. KOSLOWSKI: My name is Jessica
9 Kozlowski, K-o, z like zebra, l-o-w-s-k-i. I'm here to
10 represent any disabled people that have health issues
11 that may need to have a voice. I'm a 100 percent
12 disabled veteran with severe chronic fatigue
13 fibromyalgia. I'm in a scooter. Prior to moving to Las
14 Vegas in 2000 for one year after I got back from being
15 stationed in Korea where I got this sickness from
16 pollution issues. We -- I lived -- I'm trying -- I
17 lived within two miles of an airport. I could never get
18 any sleep ever, day or night.

19 And with fibromyalgia and chronic fatigue,
20 you sleep day and night. You have to be able to sleep
21 day and night. You have no choice. But the thing is
22 you don't sleep very well and any kind of noise issue
23 whether it be your cat kneading will wake you up. So a
24 plane specifically would probably affect me so badly to
25 be put on -- I would get no sleep whatsoever.

1 So I have -- when I moved to Las Vegas in
2 2000, I specifically asked the realtor to find me a
3 property that was well away from the airport because of
4 my numerous health issues which are life threatening if
5 not taken care of properly. And living where I live
6 now, I only get a few military helicopter planes over
7 this area, enough to wake me up for sure, but not enough
8 where I'm getting zero sleep. So my health has improved
9 50 percent from living in San Antonio near an airport.

10 So my two issues are the noise level which
11 even the smallest noise will effect someone with an
12 illness like mine, and I'm sure there are plenty of us
13 here in Las Vegas -- because you're a great place for
14 people to retire to when health issues are prevalent.
15 And the other issue is severe allergies. When I get in
16 to town, my husband drives me to the downtown area -- if
17 I take 95 past Sahara downtown, my throat will start
18 closing automatically. I can't help it. Even though
19 you see a plane two miles up in the sky, my throat
20 automatically closes and breathing is very difficult.

21 So I do not do much business down in the
22 Henderson area because it is an unhealthy place for
23 someone like me that is so susceptible to any toxins in
24 the air. Even if they are invisible toxins, I know it.
25 And I call it the airport effect. I know that as soon

1 as I reach 95 past Sahara, I'm hitting the airport area
2 and my throat closes down. So I know that I cannot do
3 any business in that area. Very rarely do we go there
4 unless it is not offered anywhere else. So that is
5 another great concern of mine is the residual pollution
6 that will fall.

7 You cannot help it from falling. It will
8 fall and it will spread over 10 more miles from where
9 that plane is banging which will probably hit my area in
10 the northwest along with noise. So I'm trying to find
11 out, if this happens, if we cannot stop it, what kind of
12 financial remuneration will someone in my position get?
13 Someone who is a 100 percent disabled who has no choice
14 who -- when we come to both pollution and noise level is
15 so detrimental to the health?

16 It's deadly. What will happen is it has
17 cost me \$200,000 over what I thought what the house
18 values at now to handicap the home for myself. I will
19 not be able to sell the home for anywhere close to what
20 I have already put into it to make it handicap
21 accessible for my knees. I'm stuck in a pit if this
22 happens and I'm in tears. Please have someone contact
23 me.

24 MS. SAVERAJAAN: Jean Saverajaan. Having
25 spent the last 18 years selling real estate in Las

1 Vegas, I am very conscious of the airport impact of
2 airport noise on the community. Most people will not
3 choose to live in areas where planes are flying over
4 them. When we tour these areas, they hear the noise
5 immediately. They do not want to have the new proposal
6 is exactly where I have seen people make the choice to
7 buy their homes because this was not an airport flight
8 pattern for the FAA to change the daily quality of life.

9 And the value of thousands of residences
10 cannot be compared to the cost of airlines to fly
11 further west before turning. The southwest was the last
12 to develop because of the existing noise problem.
13 People who chose this area should have known that this
14 is going to be a flight pattern. It has been obvious
15 for a long time. My suggestion is to talk about this
16 but was to fly further west. And he said there's
17 something they have to set up things for that but that
18 should be what they need to work on. And whatever they
19 have to do to be able to make that route so they can
20 avoid southwest turns. You know where the mountains
21 won't fight them like we do. Thank you.

22 MR. CAPOZZI: Joe C-a-p-o-z-z-i. My comment
23 is I was at last night's meeting and I provided comments
24 and I just want to re-input a few things that they said
25 tonight. One gentleman said that because there's 70,000

1 people in the northwest and only 100 southwest that the
2 southwest should bear all of the brunt of it because
3 there's only a few people in the southwest. My answer
4 is that fuss where when it's a hundred thousand or
5 700,000, it still effects people.

6 Everybody has a concern whether it's one
7 person or a hundred people and it's easy to say, Well,
8 he sacrificed a hundred thousand in the sake and I'm not
9 sure if that's the right attitude to take. I think we
10 can do this in a way and share -- everybody share the
11 burden because from when I stand even with the increased
12 aircraft coming in southwest, still going -- still the
13 amount of airplanes that are coming in today even if
14 they divert some of the traffic northwest with the
15 increased traffic southwest.

16 It's going to be still the same amount as
17 we're getting today. So we really need to be gaining
18 anything just, well, be getting any more than we
19 currently have. What I'm thinking this proposal is all
20 about and you know you think as I said last night,
21 everyone should share this burden because of the growth
22 here and not just one area that's affected. And let's
23 be reasonable and let's be neighborly because the people
24 here I feel I think that they're better than the people
25 in the southwest because maybe their property costs a

1 little more, I don't know. This is just a feeling I
2 have. Thank you very much.

3 MR. KULAS: My name is Edward Kulas,
4 K-u-l-a-s. And I have lived in Las Vegas since 1967 and
5 this is one of the worst presentations I have ever heard
6 of. There was no time to ask any direct questions at
7 all and even when you tried to directly talk to the
8 people in charge, they just ran away from me. This is a
9 shame. It's a railroad job. I'm concerned about the
10 safety and I'd like to ask a few questions but I can
11 never get answers.

12 For example, did they take a detailed
13 population density study for these two routes? And how
14 many -- how many schools and how many churches and
15 hospitals in these two routes compared the two? The
16 other is I would like to make a recommendation that
17 rather than having these two that they proposed that
18 they consider having the planes take a steeper departing
19 rate and go over 215. Once they hit 215, there's plenty
20 of empty places to go east, to go south or north.

21 So that would solve the problem of going
22 over the heavily densely population areas. The other
23 thing is they talked about fuel requirements. I'd like
24 to know what the percentage is of the additional fuel
25 requirement it would take for all airplanes compared to

1 their entire fuel usage for the year and I'll bet it's a
2 very, very small percentage. So that going that little
3 bit of distance to 215, not going over the mountains,
4 but just going to 215 and either north and south is not
5 going to have an economic impact on the airlines.

6 The other question I wanted to ask is who is
7 going to make the financial decision? Is it the FAA?
8 Is it the City Council? I'd like to know the names and
9 the telephone numbers and the addresses of those people
10 so that I could contact them. Because all it says here
11 is you got to put your information to a an environmental
12 secretary someplace, and she is just going to put it in
13 a book and never is going to read it.

14 But anyway, I think this is a railroad job
15 and I think the -- I think the Federal Government is
16 doing a terrible job in analyzing the problems in Las
17 Vegas. Thank you.

18 MS. DEFAEIO: Michelle, M-i-c-h-e-l-l-e.
19 Last name is D-e, capital F, a-e-i-o, address 8620 Peace
20 Way, Number 29, 89147.

21 Number one, from an environmental
22 standpoint, Clark County has about 17 percent of people
23 who are chemically injured. They cannot handle
24 chemicals or things of that nature. They're basically
25 housebound. They find shelters in housing based on

1 areas that are completely safe for them. Now, by having
2 this flight plan change, the gas fumes that they were
3 protecting themselves against now are going to be coming
4 over their heads. Their safe areas are no longer being
5 safe.

6 You have children with asthma who have a
7 chemical issue. Living by the Lakes, what about the jet
8 fuel and the ducks, the fish and everything in the lake,
9 is that going to have an effect? The noise level is
10 ridiculous. People bought houses in the other areas and
11 they knew they were going to wind up having the planes
12 flying overhead. That's enough.

13 DR. STRUMWASSER: My name is Dr. Strumwasser
14 and I'm outraged that the FAA blatantly stated that the
15 population density is not an important factor in this
16 decision, that other factors were like terrain were
17 considered, but population density wasn't considered.
18 To me I translate that the people were not considered
19 because population was not considered. This adversely
20 affects all 700,000 people's health. It affects their
21 hearing. It affects their structures that we live in.
22 It affects their property values which eventually
23 effects the quality of their neighborhood, and their
24 property values. There is so much to be lost here by so
25 many people.

1 And the purpose is and so many people are
2 going to lose so much and this was not taken into
3 consideration yet. It feels to me like another federal
4 bureaucratic -- like Yucca Mountain -- like -- and
5 another point was that they -- the environmental impact
6 of the government is more concerned about the tortoise
7 and it doesn't. They were more concerned about the
8 desert tortoise, and then on their habitat that their
9 people and what this does to people. Thank you.

10 SPEAKER TWELVE: My name is Susan. I'm a
11 retired nurse, and I live at Queensridge which is a very
12 nice neighborhood with million dollar plus homes that
13 are going to be very much affected by the noise level
14 that this is proposing. We're right in the very middle
15 of the noise problem. We looked on the map. We're
16 right there. It's going to really hurt property values,
17 not to mention it's going to really be bad for our
18 lifestyle. We just purchased in July. We were not told
19 anything about this. Apparently, this issue has been
20 going on for many years. The Federal Government knew
21 about it. We weren't informed until just recently.
22 That was just not fair. We should have much more of a
23 say on where the airport was going to be sending the
24 planes than we were given.

25 And, honestly, I wouldn't have moved to the

1 area if I had known there was going to be a change. And
2 now we are here only in our house for four months, for
3 five months. And we are needing to have this out. I
4 think it's a great disservice to the population. It
5 will be a change by this that make people aware of them
6 prior to. And I think it just shows a lack of concern
7 for these citizens of this town. The Federal Government
8 is just doing whatever it feels like doing, not thinking
9 about the people or are concerned. And I plan on going
10 and telling everybody in my neighborhood to get out and
11 put their word in about this. I think people weren't
12 made enough aware of it. I plan on putting my time in
13 and I plan on educating people as far as what's
14 happening. That's why I'm here tonight because I'm
15 going to spread the word.

16 I believe people aren't here tonight just
17 because they don't know about it. And they're going to
18 be very outraged when they find out what is really
19 happening. A lot more people would be here. We are
20 going to get them. We just don't have them right now
21 because they don't know about it. That's all I have to
22 say.

23 MR. PRUDE: My address is 1000 Star Lamb
24 Street, 89145. My main complaint is: Number one, the
25 noise factor. Number two, property factors. Number

1 three, or shall I say number one, the real main factor
2 is the dangers of the planes flying overhead. There's a
3 possibility of them crashing and killing thousands of
4 people in the heavily populated areas such as the Lakes,
5 the Peccole and Summerlin area where I live. And they
6 should not be allowed to fly over those heavily
7 populated areas at no time because of the safety of
8 people that's involved.

9 I highly protest the new flight plans for
10 those reasons. And I hope that it's not passed and that
11 they are using an alternative route to fly. Having been
12 around the world 22 times and flown in every state and
13 we have in every major city. Being an entertainer, I
14 have learned the negative aspects of flying such as
15 heavily, heavy air turbulence, possible crashing, heavy
16 air turbulence that I have been in that the plane has
17 dropped one to two to three thousand feet just at the
18 time developed.

19 You don't know if you're going to come out
20 of it alive or not since we do have turbulence. And
21 taking off and landing here in Las Vegas, it's extremely
22 dangerous to be flying over these heavily populated
23 areas and especially the extremely expensive homes that
24 the people have bought under the belief that they would
25 be safe.

1 SPEAKER THIRTEEN: You make mention of
2 5,000 feet. Is 5,000 feet of airport and the airport is
3 at 2,200 from the 5,000 to 3,000.

4 MR. MEADOWS: If the first cross which is at
5 about 5,000, that is sea level so at that first at or
6 above sea level which is between 20 feet, 103,000 above
7 the ground. Keep in mind that is a thousand than the
8 over procedure.

9 SPEAKER FOURTEEN: Is there any ability to
10 today's aircraft to have a higher takeoff rating to get
11 a little higher altitude?

12 MR. MEADOWS: Well, part of what we look at
13 when we designed the procedure, we put very high
14 (Inaudible) the more they can't fly. So what we try to
15 do (Inaudible) just highest altitude but still unable
16 for the aircraft to fly.

17 SPEAKER FIFTEEN: One last question.
18 Straight west is absolutely in the consideration --

19 MR. MEADOWS: Well, 2000 process and this
20 one to be honest with you there were none unfortunately
21 that we use what we call (Inaudible) and that provides
22 certain and (Inaudible) shows what the instructions are
23 and unfortunately -- and two, procedure it goes straight
24 all the way around.

25 SPEAKER SIXTEEN: (Inaudible). A couple of

1 things. One, when we bought our house eight to ten
2 years ago, we report certain things in mind and the
3 changes that are -- that are affecting our homes, our
4 value of homes relating to the condition. The City used
5 to teach one mile airport extensions, our school, the
6 planes that way like that and been there and how we --
7 because now like that but facts to happen in 2001 since
8 two and one, this community because most people need the
9 air and Federal Government in Las Vegas and Red Rock.

10 We have grown tremendously -- growth now
11 over homes where before the area was desert. The
12 airport was designed because of this design now burning
13 over metropolitan areas, school areas and taken into
14 consideration the growth today as what we have. I live
15 in Summerlin. Essentially, Sun City for Rampart and
16 Lake Mead, somewhere in that area. I think that's
17 somewhere near where we retirement community people what
18 we left at both homes. This is now our home to come
19 here to avoid this. Most of that safety take visit
20 right out populated areas. We're heading in from a
21 safety aspect.

22 MR. MEADOWS: Just bring -- you brought up
23 first that we have property, an airport today and as a
24 whole fleet as a whole is why. Okay. With very few,
25 just a few 727s, and for the folks who lived here in

1 Summerlin. This is something to the benefit of last
2 night who live southwest didn't see this session but as
3 we develop and use this right turn still happened full
4 of 727s that we had. They don't have the navigational
5 equipment that's required to fly through this procedure
6 in 747s. Chicago, New York, and Minneapolis. They
7 still have to fly the left turn.

8 Now, there is a period of time for the last
9 four years was but even that changes in 2001, we saw
10 right turns and because of all the arrival traffic that
11 we talked about, but late at night especially within the
12 last year or 18 months, we are very busy after
13 11 o'clock p.m. And we have no arrivals at that time.
14 There's a time taking aircraft turning right 727s. Now,
15 granted that not as far as it is a new procedure, but
16 between 11:00 p.m. and 12:30, 25 aircraft and do the
17 right turn to the north for the last four years.

18 You know, that something is in a document
19 and I'm not -- that's not something about information
20 that looking for in assessment in the drafts, but I will
21 point out that -- keep in mind in 1999 before 2000, this
22 area enlarge of Nevada trails road ran much large area
23 right now where people are very happily and very
24 quickly. And at the time that part of the Valley got
25 about 40 percent because 60 percent point right. Yes,

1 it is something that we can consider when we take a look
2 at what changes need to be made. We can find out an
3 area out in the middle of the desert, low residential
4 areas whatsoever.

5 Unfortunately, as an airport develops as the
6 city grows, there was an initial area that seemed to go
7 airport landing in the airport and we still have the
8 need to get the aircraft out. So the noise is out
9 there. It's a matter out of where the noise is going to
10 go. So when it's not here and 2001 for the changes to
11 put the aircraft out there or, unfortunately, folks here
12 tonight that live up in this area -- there are -- there
13 really is not part of the Valley that doesn't get
14 aircraft noise.

15 Unfortunately, like I said, this area has
16 had a minimal amount of noise for a couple of years now
17 as far as the aircraft. So we turn some out a lot of
18 arrivals in use. So to keep up with the noise of the
19 aircraft we now because airport east and south or
20 whether you're northeast or deep west or southwest and
21 now northwest part of living in an area where a major
22 airport is. Everybody's unhappy to take share of the
23 noise, and we don't pick and choose and these people
24 should get all the noise.

25 We look at what is the best procedure to do

1 what we need to do to efficiently move the aircraft and
2 what can we do to mitigate in national recourse.

3 SPEAKER SEVENTEEN: I have a comment is
4 about the process of Las Vegas. I used to do community
5 involvement and now I think you're following with these
6 public meetings. I do not believe that you're following
7 the spirit a lot. I believe that 25 years to have an
8 open meeting in an area where you have no street lights
9 and you have to -- I had to pull to the side of the road
10 to my kid's street, turn on my brights to see the lights
11 to even get here. And there are places that you could
12 have had this meeting where you would not have this
13 difficult time to come.

14 The other thing that I'm concerned about is
15 where you have the impact shown on the maps. You're not
16 even listing the street names and it makes it very
17 difficult. So, okay, I can't quite figure out where my
18 street is, then, I can't be upset. But you cannot see
19 street names that are listed in areas that aren't
20 effected, of course, you don't have the major street
21 areas listed in areas that are effected. And I think,
22 again, we are polling the measure of the law with this
23 process and have community people come in. But you're
24 not following the expert of the law in giving us no
25 information or provided a situation where you can get

1 community input.

2 MR. MEADOWS: Well, let me say about the
3 streets. Joe is right there. You've got the streets on
4 it. There's not -- we've done the charts in the back,
5 clear in the back with streets up over here. We have
6 the streets other -- did you know one of the things that
7 happened in 2001 when we went through this outset is
8 narrow it down and subtract that and commission City
9 Council, and everybody that will require to be in favor
10 saying that this is where we were going to hold the
11 public workshops.

12 There was very poor attendance. So the
13 commitment I made back then after working with them
14 right before it was implemented because I wasn't here at
15 the time that it was actually being implemented. But I
16 made the implement back then we would be very, very
17 public about it. That's why we need to let everybody
18 know what this is about. This is the procedure we want
19 you to be aware. We want you to know what the impact is
20 going to be and where the procedure is going to be.

21 Like I said, there was never an intent last
22 time to not share information but people perceive it
23 that way because we never went on TV or we never mailed
24 something to them. So even though we did what we are
25 hired to do last night, unfortunately do it. And I

1 guess we could also -- will be subject to that. Keep in
2 mind, we did this time is specifically I called a press
3 conference just so the media would pick up and would be
4 aware we were having this public meeting.

5 SPEAKER EIGHTEEN: I heard you say that as
6 current situations about a third of the night that may
7 go eastbound, make your right turn and because that's
8 the portion of the aircraft are not equipment are
9 technology moving forward, giving it an update and more
10 planes have technology without saying considerably.

11 MR. MEADOWS: The union because right now
12 today the entire fleet in and out of McCarran is almost
13 on that level. So the total noise population right now
14 -- so another third to 10 percent, 33 percent.

15 SPEAKER EIGHTEEN: I'm sorry. Just a point
16 of clarification between the rest of the flights. Which
17 ones are shorter routes right through? So what is the
18 different changes about the (Inaudible) --

19 MR. MEADOWS: Well, everybody is allowed to
20 what this procedure requires is specific equipment on
21 board on the flight plan, and it's our equipment. Like
22 I said, 90 percent of almost 90 percent of the aircraft
23 operated at McCarran have that equipment on right now
24 and are running in groups. All these existing routes in
25 this southeast are also 90 percent of flying. Some

1 aircraft also happened (Inaudible) still procedure.

2 Like I said, we're 90 percent are like 70 (Inaudible).

3 And you know civil general division aircraft
4 that air -- if that flight management system that you
5 unfolded was in at which time 5 percent and where he
6 documented figures as much as 33 percent, so even when
7 everybody is up to 100 percent up on that flying in
8 McCarran within that 25, 33 percent.

9 SPEAKER EIGHTEEN: Basically, the way I see
10 it on the list, so even 25 percent, McCarran we didn't
11 have a lot of flights. So I understand we have that
12 problem since the problem from day number one. Did
13 anybody propose a new airport like in Jean would be
14 affecting an airport is increased? See anybody talking
15 about getting a new airport?

16 MR. MEADOWS: And the airport -- down
17 airport -- that's the airport capacity is about 53
18 billion passengers a year. They are anticipating
19 getting that about 2012, seven years from now. I'm not
20 sure how long that they will be working on this, but
21 they are acquiring planes down California. They're
22 building an airport. Like I said, I don't know how long
23 they have been working on it. At that time, they're not
24 estimating it to be complete until 2017.

25 And as it would be seen in the last three

1 years is very, very high for normal airport growth for
2 the last three years. But even with modest growth in
3 the next five to seven years, the airport just over on
4 the passengers last year 2004 affected above that this
5 year. And that's why we figure within that seven year
6 hit, 53 billion mark even with so -- flights and the
7 noise before that's in --

8 SPEAKER NINETEEN: This is ridiculous
9 because all the homes were not to the people southwest.
10 I knew it was on the home near an airport FAA
11 (Inaudible) window, installation, everything, model our
12 homes are not built for that beam. Summerlin -- I'm
13 that the airport ignore which I talk about on this true
14 airport noise. That so with the homes what we paid for
15 them because we didn't buy southwest airport homes. So
16 I'll get all this traffic model homes. It's not suited
17 for airport and for the appear to have take it and then
18 later same 20 years responding. (Inaudible).

19 MR. MEADOWS: Well, keep in mind, I don't
20 know how long everybody -- homeowners lived in this
21 area. Prior to 2001, noise in this area when we
22 published a statement in 2001, we kept a lot from the
23 FAA. The intent was never to do away with the residence
24 and how much for a period of time but it has never --
25 it's always been a public case and it's been always used

1 to some extent. And like it was said, it was never our
2 intent to have over this. I apologize to this. If I
3 can't answer for the bill. I can't do that because it's
4 all public case to show the traffic area.

5 SPEAKER TWENTY: When you talk about 5,000
6 feet, 7,000 feet in the right-hand turn, was that
7 developed based on what the aircraft can accomplish
8 doing those turns, and if they can increase in your
9 opinion?

10 MR. MEADOWS: We could raise the Valley as
11 high, but keep in mind the more we raise them, the more
12 aircraft we can't comply with. And what we need is a
13 procedure that takes about 25 percent of what occurred
14 on the traffic on this new procedure to head out of
15 southwest. So what we did is we put the altitude high,
16 a high enough altitude as we could, number of aircraft
17 and to procedure.

18 SPEAKER TWENTY-ONE: The Southern Nevada
19 Water Authority owns property rights along Highway 95
20 between Valley View and Rancho. That's where we have
21 sealed a well system. That's where the profits are and
22 I don't know part and they're also putting south area
23 walls. And Southern Nevada Water Authority put in
24 millions, millions of dollars into the wall that door
25 property that they're doing environment putting this

1 area national preserve with the Anglos and stuff like
2 that.

3 The aircraft that's going to be coming down
4 Lake Mead at this point will be increasing the sound.
5 That's going to be in this area. With the FAA and any
6 conversation with Southern Nevada Water Authority
7 regarding this institution?

8 MR. MEADOWS: And one's an organization but
9 what this process is even the opportunity when it's a
10 stated government. How are you serving a historical
11 area native more than with this everybody an opportunity
12 to point out things that we may have that they're aware
13 of? So my expectation is if that is an area of concern
14 for water authority and this certain contact which we
15 will address something mitigate through this process.

16 SPEAKER TWENTY-TWO: Any other state agency
17 they wouldn't have to be considered an emergency recap
18 for agencies player mention every be we so we did reach
19 out to all the fellows asking. I just want to be really
20 clear because I don't -- I'm getting that feeling.
21 That's not what this is about. I'm getting the feeling
22 that it is not really what the intention is. You're
23 just telling us this has happened, yell, scream and cry
24 and spill our guts and nothing is going to be done about
25 it. This is what it is, period. Unless, some flight

1 path that's going to fly that way, nothing else is going
2 to change.

3 MR. MEADOWS: And I hate to be that cut and
4 dry. But, yes, we have what is every possible
5 alternative to what alternative, and as a result the
6 airport informs and using different federation and with
7 the land frame for the airport has managed (Inaudible)
8 airport along that CMA. This is the best proposal that
9 we can come up with unless there's a significant impact
10 to identify in the law environmental policy. This will
11 go forward. That has published.

12 SPEAKER TWENTY-THREE: I'm great you think
13 this is a good proposal that the residences of Summerlin
14 and Northwest bought in that area because they weren't
15 in a flight plan. I'm not happy. Were there any
16 specific safety issues, i.e., air pollution or anything
17 that occurred that dictated that you should similarly
18 using this flight plan more than you had in the past?

19 MR. MEADOWS: Well, that's a good question.
20 Keep in mind, satisfying local, what we find is that
21 when we become less efficient, (Inaudible) safety
22 compromise. So right now because everything is really
23 in one direction, we have had to slow down the operation
24 which is sufficient. So as traffic continuing to
25 increase here, if we don't address the efficiency, we

1 either overtie the airport or we have to compromise the
2 safety to keep up with the capacity. So to increase
3 efficiency now, there is a way to address the impact on
4 what increase in. So overall --

5 SPEAKER TWENTY-FOUR: I just wanted to know
6 if there was specific issues that occurred in air lift
7 delays, something that made you guys think that it is
8 needed?

9 MR. MEADOWS: Necessarily, safety issue.
10 They are fierce during the certain times of the day,
11 departure aircraft from six minutes, sometimes nine.
12 One of we had in excess 400 delays that were anywhere
13 from 30 to 60 minutes, just a lot of that is to use
14 traffic or especially vent. But just during normal
15 operation our delays are increasing as the traffic goes
16 north.

17 SPEAKER TWENTY-FIVE: My only other concern
18 is you said you had quite a few of departures after 11
19 p.m. So that's not a good comparing factor. You start
20 saying that departures after 11:00 p.m. over this new
21 flight plan. That's not a safety --

22 (11:00) MR. MEADOWS: Well, like I said, after
23 p.m., we have departures in Nevada. Okay. During the
24 daytime, it might be busy, especially daytime. If I
25 didn't have arrival traffic, I would do a right turn,

1 then so as published, because I can't. But the point I
2 was making about the 11:00 p.m. traffic. That's all
3 they have is a large number about 78 departures in a
4 short period of time during that. I don't have the
5 (11:00) traffic, 20 to 25 departures to touch right after
6 p.m.

7 SPEAKER TWENTY-SIX: I have a question. You
8 said the airport right now is about 40 million
9 passengers and that the capacity is 53 billion
10 passengers and looking at continued growth, can you take
11 this estimate that we have 211 airplanes make a right
12 turn before Thanksgiving and looking at 63 million
13 passengers, tell me what this increase is going to be
14 and that would only fall at 25 percent? So you're
15 looking at a third. So how many airplanes have you
16 looked at in this flight plan?

17 MR. MEADOWS: As far as the aircraft
18 operation goes, we are estimating about a 3 percent
19 increase at the last couple of years at a time. But
20 keep in mind, we forget 53 million passengers without
21 increasing the number of operations very much at the
22 airport. I can't say whether or not that's happening.
23 But remember the number of passengers is proportion to
24 the number of the flights only to a certain extent. If
25 an area of a lot of smaller aircraft like 737s it takes

1 a lot.

2 That number as passengers can grow if they
3 substitute for larger aircraft than the passenger
4 traffic. But just from a projection standpoint, I think
5 projections up 3 to 5 percent increase. So if you look
6 at 211 for the next seven years at a 5 percent increase,
7 you're looking at 10 aircraft per year at 5 percent.

8 SPEAKER TWENTY-SEVEN: My comment is
9 regarding about the issues regarding the dust and how it
10 effected people like me who are on breathing ventilating
11 tubes. This had got to increase the dust. And we had a
12 little discussion. You have airplane dust, and what
13 they have studied about the environment and at the
14 environment.

15 MR. MEADOWS: Okay. I can't speak to that
16 point. But as I said earlier, any discussion that I
17 cannot answer is being recorded and the answers to the
18 questions will be made in the draft document that is
19 published that can be answered. Unfortunately, I'm not
20 an --

21 SPEAKER TWENTY-EIGHT: Other than the
22 proposed right turn you said that now this is going to
23 take effect about 33 percent increase over the affecting
24 area, but as the next 25 years, that's an increase. Has
25 the rule incorporated a limit of 33 percent exactly of

1 the 33 percent and what outside (Inaudible) --

2 MR. MEADOWS: Well, we expect the percentage
3 of the total through the level. Like I said, the
4 document, the assessments that we are doing is
5 supplement. The concern models considered increase in
6 traffic. The new airport is being built in different
7 parts of the country if there is one. So keep in mind
8 that the FAA procedure is to file the specific
9 designations in specific parts of the country. So we
10 expect that 25 percent to occur constant as traffic
11 increasing. There's no requirement.

12 SPEAKER TWENTY-NINE: (Inaudible).

13 MR. MEADOWS: No. We -- this is based on
14 the projection of what we know to be true which is where
15 air area -- I don't know, sir. Is there something
16 addressed in the environmental software and that
17 contains variables are on size?

18 SPEAKER THIRTY: Okay. This in
19 consideration of retiring all of the state one, two,
20 three of the flights and just most (Inaudible) --

21 MR. MEADOWS: Yeah, like I said earlier, the
22 one of the consent of this is just even the last four
23 years of fleets operating at McCarran is much quieter
24 than four years ago. With all aircraft compliance
25 (Inaudible) get seven on them, but a 727 is still a

1 pretty noisy airplane. But we only have a handful of
2 those operating and what we been looked in consideration
3 is exactly what you talked about the noise is projection
4 of what aircraft required.

5 SPEAKER THIRTY-ONE: -- increased smoke so
6 the increased traffic, 95 airport is flying is
7 (Inaudible) --

8 MR. MEADOWS: With the increased number of
9 airplanes in the future, the airplanes are quieter
10 airplanes and the noise level is going to be a lot
11 noisier anyway. Well, I don't know. Correct me if I'm
12 wrong on the knowledge of what noise requirements, what
13 stage requirements are they outlaying now?

14 MR. LIEBER: Future aircraft noise trend.

15 MS. IZEN: Brenda Izen, I-z-e-n, and I live
16 in Sun City, Summerlin. And I'm concerned not only with
17 the noise factor of being able to enjoy golf, tennis,
18 swimming, and so forth in a retirement community. But
19 I'm also concerned about the effects it will have on the
20 air pollution and the quality of the air as it effects
21 myself with asthma and other people with asthma. That I
22 feel that the air is going to be more polluted because
23 of the airplanes as well as being -- decibels being
24 increased with the sound to have more airplanes and is
25 going to effect my hearing, and other people's hearing.

1 And it's going to generally effect the
2 quality of life, not only of me, but there are 14,000
3 residents that live in Sun City, Summerlin that have
4 moved there to enjoy retirement and play golf, and go
5 swimming, and play tennis, among other things. And
6 probably most of them did not come to this meeting
7 because this is out of the way. And I would like to see
8 them have an impact study by coming to the community
9 center in Sun City in Summerlin, and see a great many
10 people come, probably tens of thousands. Thank you.

11 MR. IZEN: My name is Ray Izen, I-z-e-n, and
12 I'm from Sun City as well. Two of the things that --
13 one, we moved here to get away from it, urbanization and
14 planes, and things like that. And I'm looking to
15 retire. But more so the safety of the flights being
16 over populated areas with the growth in Las Vegas in the
17 past six or eight years, especially the areas that we
18 are flying over are heavily populated, where back in
19 2001 they were desert. And that should greatly effect
20 it.

21 God forbid, the planes go down or something
22 happened negatively, it's over a highly populated area
23 where previously they were flying out over unpopulated
24 areas that were designed and kept vacant in the areas in
25 the BLM land and Clark County had around the airport

1 because of the noise level. My daughter lives in
2 Summerlin and will be much more affected by this, and
3 even we will live in Sun City. And, again, house values
4 and everything else were purchased, and based on what we
5 have and changes like this are totally unexpected. Yes,
6 we live in a city with an airport, but we live 15 to 20
7 miles away from the airport or at least an half hour
8 drive away from the airport. And that's where the
9 flights will be going and also at the low level. So I'm
10 concerned about safety. Thank you.

11 SPEAKER THIRTY-THREE: I guess I was
12 wondering -- I'm sure -- can I continue pass the
13 mountain? One of the reasons it has to go through maybe
14 the maintenance -- I guess altitude at McCarran to go
15 out up is that detective.

16 MR. MEADOWS: Okay. When we built the
17 procedure, we have certain requirements at that time.
18 FAA is -- and what that does like terrain, such and
19 everything else, unfortunately, or too high or too close
20 to the airport for us to be able to publish a procedure.
21 Ideally, if we could do that in the road, but
22 unfortunately we're too high, we can't meet our own
23 three-tier by going that high.

24 SPEAKER THIRTY-THREE: I understand.

25 MR. MEADOWS: I receive the line on one

1 slide. I did put that back up there. This is a white
2 line hereby to the north is between us and while it
3 approaches us so what we did so we could go apart up but
4 because we can't get people (Inaudible).

5
6 (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded
7 at 8:34 p.m.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 STATE OF NEVADA)
3) ss:
4 COUNTY OF CLARK)

5 I, Cindy R. Bowden, a duly commissioned
6 Notary Public, Clark County, State of Nevada, do hereby
7 certify that I took down in shorthand (Stenotype) all of
8 the proceedings had in the before-entitled matter at the
9 time and place indicated; and that thereafter said
10 shorthand notes were transcribed into typewriting at and
11 under my direction and supervision and the foregoing
12 transcript constitutes a full, true and accurate record
13 of the proceedings had.

14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have set my hand in my
15 office in the County of Clark, State of Nevada, this 6th
16 day of January, 2005.

17
18
19
20 
21
22 CINDY R. BOWDEN, CCR #815
23
24
25

This Page Intentionally Left Blank.